



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,022	03/25/2002	Toshihiro Morita	275729US6PCT	4603
22850	7590	07/16/2007	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			GARG, YOGESH C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3625		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/16/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[patentdocket@oblon.com](mailto:patentdocket@oblon.com)  
[oblonpat@oblon.com](mailto:oblonpat@oblon.com)  
[jgardner@oblon.com](mailto:jgardner@oblon.com)

<b><i>Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/889,022	MORITA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Yogesh C. Garg	3625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yogesh C. Garg. (3) Michael Monaco.

(2) Soumya Panda. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 05 July 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stebbins & SDMI.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Messrs Monaco and Panda argued that teachings of references Stebbings and SDMI are not combinable for reasons indicated in 413A-Application Initiated Interview Request form received on 7/5/2007 and enclosed herewith. The Examiner discussed the reasons as why those those arguments could not overcome the rejection submitted in the Final action mailed on 3/20/2007. Messrs Monaco and Panda further discussed proposed amendments to claim1 which Examiner agreed to consider fully and diligently on receipt of a formal Amendment. Examiner also advised the applicant's representatives to indicate (a) support for filed amendments and how they are distinct from the combined teachings of Stebbings and SDMI .

Docket No: 275729US

**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**Application No.: 09889022 First Named Applicant: Toshihiro MoritaExaminer: Yogesh C. Garg Art Unit: 3625 Status of Application: pending**Tentative Participants:**(1) Michael Monaco (2) Soumya Panda

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: July 5, 2007 Proposed Time: 11:00 AM

(1) [x] Telephonic (2) [ ] Personal (3) [ ] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ ] YES [ ] NO

If yes, provide brief description: *changed to 2:30 PM at applicant's request***Issues To Be Discussed**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>103</u>	<u>Claim 1</u>	<u>Stebbins and SDMI</u>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
(2) _____	_____	_____	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]

[  ] Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**Discuss (1) whether there is a reasonable expectation of success of combining Stebbings with the SDMI publication, and (2) whether Stebbings and SDMI teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention.An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 7/5/2007.**NOTE:**

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible

*Yogesh*

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)